

1 Christian Gabroy, Esq.
2 Nev. Bar No. #8805
3 Kaine Messer, Esq.
4 Nev. Bar No. #14240
5 GABROY LAW OFFICES
6 The District at Green Valley Ranch
7 170 South Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280
Henderson, Nevada 89012
Tel: (702) 259-7777
Fax: (702) 259-7704
christian@gabroy.com
kmesser@gabroy.com

8 Stuart J. Miller (*Pro Hac Vice* pending)
9 LANKENAU & MILLER, LLP
10 132 Nassau Street, Suite 1100
New York, NY 10038
P: (212) 581-5005
F: (212) 581-2122
stuart@lankmill.com

11 Mary E. Olsen (*Pro Hac Vice* pending)
12 M. Vance McCrary (*Pro Hac Vice* pending)
13 THE GARDNER FIRM, PC
14 182 St. Francis Street
Suite 103
Mobile, Alabama 36602
P: (251) 433-8100
F: (251) 433-8181

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff Joshua Hoover

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

19 JOSHUA HOOVER on behalf of himself and
20 all others similarly situated,

Case No.:

21 Plaintiff,

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

22 v.

AND JURY DEMAND

23 NS8, INC.

24 Defendant.

25 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

26

27

28

1 Joshua Hoover (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself and a class of those similarly
2 situated, by way of Complaint against NS8, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant”) by and
3 through his counsel alleges as follows:

4 NATURE OF THE ACTION

5 1. This is a civil action for collection of unpaid wages and benefits for sixty
6 (60) calendar days pursuant to the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act of 1988
7 29 U.S.C. §§ 2101-2109 et seq. (the “WARN Act”). The Plaintiff was an employee of the
8 Defendant until he was terminated as part of, or as a result of a mass layoff and/or plant closing
9 ordered by the Defendant. As such, the Defendant is liable under the WARN Act for the failure
10 to provide the Plaintiff and the other similarly situated former employees at least 60 days’
11 advance written notice of termination, as required by the WARN Act.

12 2. Plaintiff also bring this action against Defendant on behalf of himself and
13 the other similarly situated former employees seeking accrued but unused vacation time.

14 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
16 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(5).

17 4. The violation of the WARN Act alleged herein occurred in this District
18 and more particularly in Las Vegas, NV. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
19 §2104 (a)(5).

20 THE PARTIES

21 5. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times Defendant was a
22 Delaware corporation which maintained a facility at 241 W Charleston Blvd, Las Vegas, NV
23 89102 (the “Facility”).

24 6. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Joshua Hoover was an employee who was
25 employed by Defendant and worked at or reported to the Facility until his termination without
26 cause on or about September 11, 2020 and thereafter.

27 7. On or about September 11, 2020 and thereafter, Defendant ordered the
28 termination of the Plaintiff’s employment together with the termination of approximately 220

other employees who worked at or reported to the Facility as part of a mass layoff and/or plant closing as defined by the WARN Act, for which they were entitled to receive 60 days advance written notice under the WARN Act.

8. At or about the time the Plaintiff was terminated, Defendant ordered the termination of approximately 220 other similarly situated employees who worked at or reported to Facility (the "Other Similarly Situated Employees").

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS – 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(5)

9. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(5), the Plaintiff maintains this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of each of the Other Similarly Situated Employees.

10. Each of the Other Similarly Situated Former Employees is similarly situated to the Plaintiff in respect to his or her rights under the WARN Act.

11. Defendant was required by the WARN Act to give the Plaintiff and the Other Similarly Situated Employees at least 60 days advance written notice prior to their terminations.

12. Prior to their terminations, neither the Plaintiff nor the Other Similarly Situated Employees received written notice that complied with the requirements of the WARN Act.

13. Defendant failed to pay the Plaintiff and the Other Similarly Situated Employees their respective wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, accrued holiday pay and accrued vacation for sixty (60) days following their respective terminations and failed to make 401(k) contributions and provide them with health insurance coverage and other employee benefits.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS RULES 23 (a) and (b)

14. The Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and, pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the other employees who worked at the Facility and were terminated as part of a mass layoff and/or plant closing ordered by the Defendant at the Facility on or about September 11, 2020 and thereafter ("the "Class").

1 15. The persons in the Class identified above ("Class Members") are so
2 numerous that joinder of all Class Members is impracticable.

3 16. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class Members that
4 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.

5 17. The claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the
6 Class.

7 18. The representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
8 the Class.

9 19. The Plaintiff has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex
10 class action employment litigation.

11 20. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
12 efficient adjudication of this controversy—particularly in the context of WARN Act litigation,
13 where an individual Plaintiff and Class Members may lack the financial resources to vigorously
14 prosecute a lawsuit in federal court against a corporate defendant.

15 21. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class Members that
16 predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class, including but
17 not limited to:

- 18 (a) Whether the Class Members were employees of the Defendant who worked at
19 or reported to the Facility;
- 20 (b) Whether Defendant terminated the employment of the Class Members as part
21 of a mass layoff and/or plant closing without cause on their part and without
22 giving them 60 days advance written notice;
- 23 (c) Whether the Defendant may rely on the WARN Act's "unforeseeable business
24 circumstances" or "faltering company" defense.
- 25 (d) Whether Defendant's failure to provide 60 days' notice should render it liable
26 to the Class Members for 60 days' pay and benefits.

27 **WARN ACT CLAIM**

1 22. At all relevant times, Defendant employed 100 or more employees,
2 exclusive of part-time employees, or employed 100 or more employees who in the aggregate
3 worked at least 4,000 hours per week exclusive of hours of overtime within the United States as
4 defined by the WARN Act and employed more than 50 employees at the Facility.

5 23. At all relevant times, Defendant was an “employer,” as that term is
6 defined in 29 U.S.C. § 2101(a)(1) of WARN and 20 C.F.R. § 639.3(a).

7 24. On or about September 11, 2020 and thereafter, the Defendant ordered a
8 “mass layoff” and/or “plant closing” at the Facility as that term is defined by 29 U.S.C. §
9 2101(a)(3).

10 25. The Plaintiff and the Class Members who were terminated by Defendant
11 as a result of Defendant ordering a mass layoff and/or plant closing at the Facility on or about
12 September 11, 2020 and thereafter were “affected employees” as defined by 29 U.S.C. §
13 2101(a)(5) of the WARN Act.

14 26. The mass layoff and/or plant closing at the Facility resulted in
15 “employment losses,” as that term is defined by the WARN Act for at least fifty (50) of
16 Defendant’s employees as well as 33% of Defendant’s workforce at the Facility, excluding “part-
17 time employees,” as that term is defined by the WARN Act.

18 27. The Plaintiff and each of the Class Members are “aggrieved employees”
19 of the Defendant as that term is defined in 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(7).

20 28. Pursuant to Section 2102 of WARN and 20 C.F.R. § 639.1 - § 639.10 et
21 seq., Defendant was required to provide at least 60 days prior written notice of the terminations.

22 29. Defendant failed to provide at least sixty (60) days prior notice to the
23 Class Members of their terminations.

24 30. The Defendant failed to pay the Plaintiff and each of the Class Members
25 their respective wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, accrued holiday pay and accrued vacation
26 for 60 working days following their respective terminations, and failed to make the pension and
27 401(k) contributions, provide other employee benefits under ERISA, and pay their medical
28 expenses for 60 calendar days from and after the dates of their respective terminations.

31. As a result of Defendant's failure to pay the wages, benefits and other monies as asserted above, the Aggrieved Employees were damaged in an amount equal to the sum of the Class Members unpaid wages, accrued holiday pay, accrued vacation pay, accrued sick leave pay and benefits which would have been paid for a period of sixty (60) calendar days after the date of the members' terminations.

VACATION CLAIM

32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

33. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Defendant maintained a vacation pay policy whereby employees whose employment was terminated were entitled to pay for unused vacation time accrued to the effective date of termination.

34. Defendant was therefore obligated to pay Plaintiff in full for his accrued but unused vacation time upon his termination but failed to do so.

35. Plaintiff and the Class Member are therefore entitled to payments for accrued but unused vacation time which was due and owing upon their terminations

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff and Class Members demand judgment against the Defendant as follows:

- a. An amount equal to the sum of: unpaid wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, accrued holiday pay, accrued vacation pay pension and 401(k) contributions and other ERISA benefits that would have been covered and paid under the then applicable employee benefit plans had that coverage continued for that period, for sixty (60) working days following the member employee's termination, all determined in accordance with the WARN Act;
 - b. Certification that, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 (a) and (b) and the WARN Act, 29 U.S.C §2104(a)(5), Plaintiff and the Class Members constitute a single class;
 - c. An amount equal to the sum of accrued but unpaid vacation as of the termination date of Plaintiff and the Class Members;
 - d. Interest as allowed by law on the amounts owed under the preceding paragraphs;

- 1 e. Appointment of the undersigned attorneys as Class Counsel;
- 2 f. Appointment of Plaintiff as the Class Representative and payment of
- 3 reasonable compensation for his services as such;
- 4 g. The reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs and disbursements the
- 5 Plaintiff incurs in prosecuting this action, as authorized by the WARN Act, 29 U.S.C.
- 6 §2104(a)(6);
- 7 h. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

8 Dated: September 16, 2020

9 BY: 

10 LANKENAU & MILLER, LLP
11 Stuart J. Miller (*Pro Hac Vice pending*)
12 132 Nassau Street, Suite 1100
13 New York, NY 10038
14 P: (212) 581-5005
15 F: (212) 581-2122

16 Christian Gabroy, Esq. (#8805)
17 Kaine Messer, Esq. (#14240)
18 GABROY LAW OFFICES
19 The District at Green Valley Ranch
20 170 South Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280
21 Henderson, Nevada 89012
22 Tel: (702) 259-7777
23 Fax: (702) 259-7704
24 christian@gabroy.com
25 kmesser@gabroy.com

26 Mary E. Olsen (*Pro Hac Vice pending*)
27 M. Vance McCrary (*Pro Hac Vice pending*)
28 THE GARDNER FIRM, PC
182 St. Francis Street
Suite 103
Mobile, Alabama 36602
P: (251) 433-8100
F: (251) 433-8181

29 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*